DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 579 FL 017 459

AUTHOR DeGeorge, George P.
TITLE Assessment and Placement of Language Minority Students: Procedures for Mainstreaming. New Focus, NCBE Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education, No. 3.
INSTITUTION National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, Wheaton, MD.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 88
CONTRACT 300860069
NOTE 17p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; *Limited English Speaking; Measurement Techniques; Second Language Programs; *Student Placement
IDENTIFIERS *Mainstreaming (Non English Speaking)

ABSTRACT

The language minority and limited-English-proficient students attending American schools in increasing numbers must be prepared as well as possible for their continued education in the mainstream. This can be begun by implementing mainstreaming procedures that fairly and accurately determine student readiness for learning in the mainstream and making recommendations toward that end, treating the process as a set of placement procedures. These procedures would include defining what the various placement decisions are, determining student needs and other information needed to make those decisions, developing and implementing procedures and instruments for gathering the information, and collecting, analyzing, and interpreting it. The apparent simplicity of the steps masks complexity resulting from the interplay of variables such as program size and structure and the intricacy of individual linguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural backgrounds. Small teams of individuals from both bilingual/English-as-a-second-language and mainstream programs could have responsibility for making placement decisions. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED296579

NEW FOCUS
the national clearinghouse for bilingual education
Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education
ncbe
Number 3
Winter 1987/1988

Assessment and Placement of Language Minority Students: Procedures for Mainstreaming

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
E. Cubillos
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

George P. De George
Connecticut State Department of Education
with the collaboration of the NCBE Staff

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

INTRODUCTION

Mainstreaming is one of the important goals of all specialized instruction of limited-English-proficient students (LEP). Letting LEP students study alongside their non-LEP counterparts encourages mutual learning and decreases the possibility that the language minority student will remain isolated. This increased contact may also contribute to the improvement in self-concept for the language minority student (Placer-Barber, 1981).

Stories of language minority or LEP students who have succeeded in a monolingual English classroom after spending several years in a bilingual or English-as-a-second-language (ESL)-type program are plentiful. Such stories make us feel good about these programs and lead us to conclude that "something has gone right." Equally common are recountings of students who have done poorly and failed. These accounts cause us to feel disappointment for the programs, the students, and their parents. We are often led to ask what went wrong. Was it the program? Were the students adequately prepared, or were the students at fault?

The placement of a LEP student in an all-English mainstream program for all or part of the school day comes as the result of a complex process. To fully understand the workings of this process and the issues and considerations which comprise it, a review of the child's experience prior to being mainstreamed is necessary.

The first step in that process was to identify students in need of special academic services. Next, a determination was made as to precisely what services the student would need, and the level at which he/she should begin. As the student progressed through the program of instruction, progress was monitored periodically. As he/she successfully acquired the skills and knowledge necessary to function well in an all-English classroom, the determination was made of his/her readiness to make that transition.

Procedures for identification of LEP students and their initial placement in instructional programs varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Initially, a determination of LEP status must be made. In some states, state law mandates a particular definition of LEP status. In others, the State Education Agency (SEA) establishes regulations or policy describing the linguistic characteristics of a LEP student. Some states permit the local education agency (LEA) to determine this definition. The basic definition of LEP status, no matter what its origin, underlies all assessment procedures.

Equally diverse among the states are the actual methods used to identify students as LEP and to exit them from the specialized academic programs in which they have been placed. Some states mandate, by law, the instruments and procedures to be employed. In other states the SEA sets forth regulations for assessment. In yet other states, the SEA recommends procedures and/or instruments, but school districts may establish their own policies, and in some states all such decisions are made at district level. Table 1 (see page 10) summarizes the identification and exit methods used in selected states around the country. This table illustrates the variety of methods and instruments utilized nationwide.

Some states use the same methods for determining entry placement as are used to exit students from a given program, while other states employ different methods or instruments for this purpose. Diversity exists, too, in the number of instruments used to determine readiness to exit a program of instruction.

The purpose of this paper, then, is to stimulate discussion about what mainstreaming a language minority student really means and to encourage those who administer and implement bilingual and ESL programs to examine how well they are preparing their students to be effective learners in the English-speaking educational mainstream. Practitioners need to ask themselves whether established mainstreaming procedures

FL017459

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

enhance both teacher and student performance. This paper presents a framework, practical advice, and ideas that administrators and teachers of bilingual and ESL programs can build upon to design mainstreaming procedures or to review and possibly improve the mainstreaming policies they may already have in place.

MAINSTREAMING: A PLACEMENT DECISION

This paper views the mainstreaming of language minority students as a placement decision. It is the decision to remove or exit a LEP student from a bilingual or ESL program and place that student in the all-English mainstream educational program for either part or all of the school day.

Depending upon the structure of one's bilingual or ESL program, a mainstreaming decision can take various forms. One common type of program is an ESL resource room/pullout-type of program. In such a program, students who are already receiving mainstream subject-area instruction in such areas as mathematics and science, go to a specific resource room or study center to receive ESL instruction from a resource teacher. For these students, total mainstreaming may mean terminating their ESL studies and placing them into mainstream English reading and language arts classes.

In the case of a bilingual program which provides instruction in all subject areas through the native language as well as in English and English as a second language, mainstreaming may mean a series of placement decisions whereby students are placed into English reading and language arts classes and mainstream mathematics, science, and social studies classes, as appropriate.

MAINSTREAMING: A SET OF PROCEDURES

Mainstreaming, therefore, refers to a process or set of procedures which consists of all the steps leading up to making the various placement decisions which would place the student into the mainstream program. Those steps may include:

- Defining what the various placement decisions are;
- Determining student needs and other information needed to make those decisions;
- Developing and implementing procedures and instruments for gathering the information; and
- Collecting, analyzing, and interpreting the information (Ausubel, 1969; De George, 1985).

While these steps seem clear, simple, and logical, they mask the potential complexity which can result from the interplay of different variables, such as the size and structure of the program and the intricate nature of individual student background variables (linguistic, cognitive and sociocultural).

Native English-speaking students in American schools, as they study science, mathematics, and social studies, are at the same time acquiring the language proficiency associated with these subject areas. This occurs after they have already acquired the basic structure and vocabulary of English and have practiced it extensively in interpersonal communication situations. Their introduction to academic subject matter begins in kindergarten, or even preschool, and increases gradually as they proceed up the grade ladder.

Language minority students, on the other hand, whatever their school experience and communicative and academic abilities in their native language may be, are called upon to simultaneously go through the stages of developing interpersonal communication skills, mastering subject area content and skills, and acquiring academic language proficiency[1] for each subject area, all in their second language, English. Learning subject matter while they are also acquiring English language skills makes it difficult for language minority students to keep up with their English-speaking peers. Limited-English-proficient students may require some time to develop their communicative abilities and basic literacy skills in English before they can start using English as a tool for learning subject matter, or before they can begin transferring what they know from their native language to English. This may result in LEP students being inadvertently placed in instructional situations that are more complex for them than for students who are already proficient in English (Cummins, 1984; Tikunoff, 1985). Being aware of these differences in learning rates allows schools to develop appropriate instructional sequences which provide students with the necessary opportunities for developing academic language proficiency in English without sacrificing the acquisition of subject matter.

Precisely what types of information are needed to make mainstreaming decisions about LEP students in bilingual/ESL programs? What types of appropriate procedures and instruments are available or can be developed to gather the

[1]Academic language proficiency has been defined as the ability of the learner to manipulate effectively those aspects of language necessary in learning and communicating about academic subject areas. This involves using a specific language (e.g., English) as a medium of thought rather than as a means of interpersonal communication. As students advance in grade level, such language tends to be more decontextualized and cognitively demanding (Cummins, 1980, 1984).

requisite information efficiently and effectively? What criteria can be used to analyze student data and other information in order to make it usable for decision-making purposes?

The remainder of this paper will be devoted to answering these questions and providing a framework and practical ideas that administrators, teachers, and others who are to participate in the mainstreaming process can use to conceptualize and design mainstreaming procedures or to review and improve existing ones.

INFORMATION NEEDED FOR MAKING MAINSTREAMING DECISIONS

Sound instructional decisions require reliable and relevant information about student capabilities and achievement patterns. Deciding whether or not a language minority student is ready to be mainstreamed has often been made solely on the basis of students' oral English ability. Recent studies, however, seem to indicate that it may be beneficial to determine the status of the student with respect to the demands that will be made upon him/her in mainstream subject area classes (Chamot and O'Malley, 1986; Cummins, 1986). In other words, has the student mastered the prerequisite content and skills for all areas to be studied in the mainstream? If we are to answer this question, we need to determine the demands that will be made upon the student. The question is: How?

The notion that oral English language skills alone may be necessary but not sufficient to for a student to acquire content-area knowledge has caused considerable rethinking among administrators and classroom teachers about assessment procedures as they exist today. Researchers have found that oral language proficiency measures alone may not provide sufficient data for decision-making with regard to the schooling needs of LEP students. This is because oral language proficiency tests may not be able to predict accurately how well LEP students will perform on academic achievement tests (Canale, 1983; Cummins, 1981, 1983b; Oller, 1979). In addition, oral language proficiency tests appear to have no relationship to how well a LEP student can perform instructional tasks (Klee, 1984; Cummins, 1983a,c; Cervantes, 1979).

A LEP student may be mainstreamed anywhere along the K-12 grade-level continuum. The demands which the mainstream program will make at specific grade levels for entering students will, of course, vary. In short, what will be required of students entering the mainstream at the fourth-grade level will be quite different from that which is required of students entering at the tenth-grade level. What is needed, therefore, is a general approach to examining the demands of the mainstream upon language minority children that can be applied at any point along the K-12 grade-level continuum.

Presented below is a two-step approach, inspired by the literature on educational curricula and second-language acquisition, that attempts to address this need (Ausubel, 1969; Bloom *et al*, 1971; De George, 1983).

The first step in this approach entails the determination of the cognitive demands that will be made of the student in the mainstream, while the second step involves ascertaining the language demands of the mainstream classroom. Taken together, these two steps provide the basic information and criteria for determining whether or not a student is ready to be mainstreamed.

Step One: Determining Cognitive Demands

A. *Describe Instructional Objectives*

The first task in determining cognitive demands is to examine the curriculum and instructional objectives of the mainstream situation or grade level into which a student will be placed. Such an examination may involve the following:

- Listing the specific subject areas taught at the target grade level with special attention given to the main areas of reading and language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies;
- Breaking down subject areas into their main content and skill areas; and
- Determining the prerequisite content-knowledge and language skills necessary for successful functioning in the mainstream subject areas.

One approach to breaking down a subject area is to develop a matrix of content and skill development objectives. This approach is treated in depth in the *Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning* (Bloom, Hastings, and Madaus, 1971).

The *Guide to Curriculum Development in Science* (State of Connecticut, 1981) offers a good example of this procedure. It suggests that an eighth-grade science curriculum contain offerings on life, physical, and earth science. For each of these, the *Guide* outlines the following general concepts which students need to master:

Life Science:

- Living organisms carry on life functions;

- Living organisms and their environment are interdependent and are constantly interacting; and
- Living things change.

Physical Science:

- The physical world consists of interactions of matter and energy.

Earth Science:

- The earth and the solar system undergo changes involving different cycles.

The above are statements which outline the content to be covered in the eighth-grade science curriculum. Specified also are the skill objectives for eighth-grade science, which are to:

- Use measuring devices and record data properly;
- Make graphs and charts from the data given;
- Interpret data, charts, and graphs and make generalizations;
- Follow directions to utilize simple tests and interpret results;
- Employ mathematics necessary to convert units within the metric system;
- Develop a hypothesis from basic data and devise a method to test it;
- Use, maintain, and care for laboratory equipment;
- Distinguish between qualitative and quantitative observations;
- Follow laboratory safety rules at all times;
- Use "scientific methods" for setting up experiments which have dependent and independent variables;
- Communicate information organized in logical sequences orally and graphically using appropriate vocabulary;
- Recognize that certain teaching devices, such as a "model," are only teaching aids and are not reality; and
- Apply scientific theories and laws to a given situation (State of Connecticut, 1981).

B. *Examining Curriculum Materials and Interviewing Teachers*

Let us suppose that the above descriptions of content and skill areas represent the basic eighth-grade science curriculum in a school district. The next task, then, is to examine the texts and other curriculum materials and talk with science teachers to find out which topics and skills are stressed and the types of language and learning activities employed. This information will, in effect, answer the question of what cognitive demands will be made upon the student. Having answered that question, it will then be possible to ask what prerequisite content-knowledge and skills, if any, the seventh-grade students need in order to succeed as learners in such a course. Such prerequisite skills may already be built into the seventh-grade curriculum. If not, it might be necessary to consider revising the curriculum to ensure that students will succeed in eighth-grade science.

Step Two: Determining Language Demands of Classroom Instruction

The second step in determining information needs for making mainstreaming decisions is to determine the academic language proficiency demands made on the LEP student by classroom instruction. An approach for determining academic language proficiency skills is suggested by the work of Chamot and O'Malley (1986). In this work they suggest developing a "bridge" curriculum which facilitates the transition from bilingual and ESL programs to the mainstream. This bridge curriculum combines instruction in English as a second language with a focus on the content areas. It also provides training in the use of learning strategies as aids to comprehension and retention. Many of the learning strategies described are actually study and learning skills.

The bridge curriculum approach requires an analysis of the kinds of language used in the classroom and the uses to which that language will be put. After this has been done, students can be taught the actual academic language skills they need. Mainstream classroom language demands are different from those made in beginning-level ESL classes or in everyday social interaction and need to be taught specifically and practiced in the context of subject matter learning. To develop academic language proficiency in English for use in mainstream classes, it is suggested that the following be taught:

- Specific vocabulary and technical terminology;

- Language functions used in academic communication, such as explaining, informing, describing, clarifying, and evaluating;

- Ability to comprehend and use language structures prevailing in different subject areas, such as passive voice, long noun phrases used as subjects and objects of sentences, and sentences beginning with "because" clauses;

- Ability to comprehend discourse features found in various subject areas, such as expository discourse used to present facts and concepts, and language organized in a sequence of steps to be followed in the order given; and

- Language skills needed in the content classroom, such as listening to explanations, participating in academic discussions, reading for information, and writing reports (Ambert, Greenberg, and Pereira, 1980; Chamot and O'Malley, 1986; Hamayan, et al., 1985; Ohio Department of Education, 1983; Rivera and Lombardo, 1982; Southwest Regional Laboratory, 1980).

These five areas of language content and skills can be used as a framework which those in charge of designing mainstreaming procedures can use in determining the academic language demands made of LEP students in subject area classes. This framework can be used to analyze mainstream curriculum guides and materials, to structure consultations with mainstream teachers about language demands in their classes, and to examine the linguistic demands of teaching/learning activities in mainstream classrooms.

In applying such a framework to the eighth-grade science curriculum discussed above, one can see that students need to learn such concepts as "living organism," "environment," "matter and energy," and "cycles", as well as such terms as "data," "graphs and charts," and "generalizations." Interpreting, generalizing, and distinguishing are among the language functions that are required of students. In explaining and describing, students may have to use long noun phrases as subjects and objects of sentences and clauses beginning with "because," "since," and "when." Students may also be required to use expository discourse to present facts and concepts orally or in writing. Students will have to learn to listen to teacher lectures and demonstrations with understanding, perform reading assignments, make oral presentations using graphs and charts, and write reports about their work.

In summary, the framework for determining the language demands made by the mainstream classroom can be described as follows:

- Determine subject areas to be taught;

- Analyze each subject area by content and skill area;

- Determine prerequisite cognitive skills needed to allow students to benefit from instruction in each subject; and

- Analyze each mainstream subject area for linguistic components (vocabulary and technical terms, language structures and functions, discourse features).

Once a description of content, thinking skills, and linguistic components has been developed, one can then decide what kinds of assessment procedures and instruments may be used to assess all components.

PROCEDURES AND INSTRUMENTS FOR GATHERING INFORMATION

In this paper, assessment denotes any process used to ascertain whether and to what degree a student has a certain skill or proficiency, such as communicative competence. An assessment instrument is an actual device used to measure the attribute in question. Observation checklists and tests are examples of assessment instruments available to educators for gathering information. Assessment processes and instruments have one common purpose, the gathering of information or data which are then used for decision-making purposes.

Some instruments may be better suited for gathering certain types of information than others. (Guerin and Maier, 1983; Stanley and Hopkins, 1972). For example, cognitive skills may be more appropriately assessed by a written instrument rather than by an observation scale, whereas ability to complete class tasks may be more effectively assessed using an observation instrument rather than an oral language proficiency test (Tikunoff, 1985).

Approach to Assessment for Mainstreaming

An examination of mainstream instructional demands yields a listing of content-area topics, thinking skills, and linguistic features of academic language to be assessed. Various assessment instruments are available to educators for gathering data related to the items on those lists. However, it has been suggested that no one instrument may be sufficient for assessing all the components described in this paper. Consequently, many school districts are turning to a multiple-instrument approach for making mainstreaming decisions. This strategy combines the use of various criterion-referenced tests with teacher

judgment for assessing language minority students. This approach reflects current thought in the educational literature (Ambert, et al., 1980; Hamayan, Kwiat, and Perlman, 1985).

A criterion-referenced or objectives-based approach to assessment yields information relative to student mastery or non-mastery of specific content areas, cognitive skills, and language proficiency. This information takes the form of "discrete" items, i.e., single, isolated skills such as vocabulary knowledge, or complex, integrative skills such as participation in an academic debate. Matching assessment items to the content area, cognitive skills, and language proficiency requirements identified for measurement in the form of individual student profiles can provide a sound basis for making mainstreaming decisions about LEP students. The individual student profile is described later in this paper.

Instruments for predicting ability to function in the English-only classroom or for measuring academic language proficiency are not available at the present time (Chamot and O'Malley, 1986). Most oral English language proficiency tests currently in existence do not measure academic language proficiency as defined in this paper, and standardized tests in English confound content knowledge with language proficiency. On the basis of what exists, then, it may be beneficial to use multiple instruments in order to assess all aspects of language proficiency and content knowledge.

The use of multiple instruments can result in a much more precise picture of the language minority student because it looks at him/her from different perspectives. One instrument can be used which measures oral language proficiency. Another can be administered which assesses written language ability. An additional instrument may be developed to determine content-area mastery at the student's present grade level. Yet another instrument can be administered which reflects the teacher's observation and resulting judgment of the student's ability to function in the mainstream. Using a combination of instruments can help ensure that a student's ability to function in the English-only classroom is adequately measured. (Cavalheiro, 1981; Hamayan, et al., 1985; Hayes, 1982; Jones, 1981; Lazos, 1981).

Non-traditional informal tests, such as teacher-made instruments based on the school district's curriculum may also be employed. Informal approaches include ratings of language samples, cloze procedures, and dictation. (Hamayan, et al., 1985; Lindvall and Nitko, 1975).

At the time that mainstreaming decisions are to be made, various teachers and other program staff will have worked with and observed individual students over several years. Also, written records about the students' performance will have been created in the form of cumulative files, observation notes, anecdotal information, test scores, and grades. This information, accumulated over time, is valuable and should be brought into the mainstreaming process and entered accordingly into student profiles as evidence of development toward mastery of important content knowledge, thinking skills, and language proficiency.

CREATING AN INFORMATION-GATHERING SYSTEM FOR MAINSTREAMING

The more common assessment instruments available to educators today are as follows:

- Interview protocols and questionnaires;
- Observation checklists;
- Rating scales and criteria;
- Holistic scoring and other methods for evaluating student work samples; and
- Formal and informal tests.

As suggested above, determinations need to be made regarding which of these devices or others like them will be used to assess the various content and skill areas and linguistic features identified when examining mainstream demands upon students. It has been suggested that different instruments can be used to assess different skills and that more than one type of instrument can be used to assess the same skill, if necessary. Many content-area and cognitive skills for the various subject areas are amenable to assessment by formal tests, yet observation data and information from existing records may also be used.

After deciding which assessment procedures and instruments are to be used for measuring the target content-area knowledge, cognitive skills, and linguistic features, three possibilities exist for obtaining them: (1) Existing instruments, if appropriate, can be used; (2) existing instruments can be adapted; and (3) new instruments can be developed. Interview protocols, questionnaires, and observation checklists are the types of instruments that will most likely need to be developed. It is not within the purview of this article to discuss specific instruments, but many resources are currently available to assist bilingual and ESL educators in finding what they need.

Among the federal agencies available for technical assistance in locating specific assessment instruments and in providing training in their use are the Evaluation Assistance Center-East located at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C. serving the eastern United States (800-626-5443; 703-875-0900), and the Evaluation Assistance Center-West at the University of New

Mexico in Albuquerque, NM, serving the western United States (800-247-4269; 505- 277-7281).

Student Profile

One approach to the assessment process for mainstreaming is the development of the individual student profile. This form can be used to organize and summarize student data. It should list the relevant items under content-area knowledge, thinking skills, and academic language proficiency to be assessed for each mainstream subject area at specific grade levels. For each of these, spaces should be allocated for the recording of information and data yielded by the various assessment instruments employed. Figure 1 provides an illustrative example based on the Connecticut science curriculum cited earlier in this paper.

Depending upon many factors, including the structure of one's bilingual or ESL program, the number of students in it, the number of schools in which students are distributed, the staffing pattern, the amount of information to be collected, the number and types of instruments used, the types of recording, scoring, and reporting of results involved, and the amount of support available to the program, an information-gathering system can become cumbersome and complicated. One's goal, however, is to make the data-gathering system practical, efficient, and productive of the types of information which will allow the most valid basis possible for decision making. Developing individual student profiles may aid in this process. Other strategies for making the mainstream process more manageable include: reducing the inventories of content-area knowledge, cognitive skills, and academic language proficiency features to the most important elements; using existing data as much as is appropriate; reducing the length of assessment instruments where possible; using teacher observation and judgments judiciously; and developing a set of concise yet useful recording and information summary forms. In this regard, less assessment and fewer forms are better, within reasonable bounds.

COLLECTING, ANALYZING, AND INTERPRETING ASSESSMENT INFORMATION

Data Collection

Collecting assessment information can become complex and onerous unless an effective and efficient system is developed. Equally important is that the system be managed properly. In essence, someone must be in charge of the process and have available staff and resources to implement it. Observations need to be made and recorded on checklists, tests must be administered and scored, questionnaires have to be completed, existing data must be retrieved, student work samples and performances need to be rated, and student profiles must be filled in. All this needs to be done accurately and in accordance with specified deadlines. Effective management of the process, adequate staff and staff training, and necessary supports such as secretarial assistance, computers, and copying equipment are crucial to effective data collection.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

After the most reliable information available for each student on achievement relative to content knowledge, cognitive skills, and language proficiency is summarized on student profiles, it can be analyzed and interpreted. In a criterion-referenced approach, data are analyzed in terms of mastery and non-mastery. For all items on the student profile, the first question to consider is whether or not the information provided on the profile is relevant, sufficient, and accurate. It is then that an analysis can be made of the degree to which the evidence indicates mastery or non-mastery of the content, skill, or academic language proficiency in question. As the evidence accumulates and is analyzed on each student profile, a picture is pieced together of the student's overall grasp of each subject area and his/her proficiency in dealing with the subject matter through English with respect to the mainstream grade or situation for which the student is being considered.

The underlying criterion and ultimate interpretation is whether or not the student has sufficient mastery of subject area content, skills, and language proficiency to be a successful learner in a specific mainstream situation. In addition to the information recorded on student profiles, the experience and insight of those analyzing and interpreting the data have much to do with whether well-informed and effective mainstreaming decisions are made with respect to language minority students.

Figure 1

Language Minority Student Profile

Name: _____ Grade level leaving: _____

Length of time in program: _____ Grade level entering: _____

Subject: Science (8th Grade)

Assessment Areas

A. *Content-Area Topics*

Life Science:
(1) Living organisms carry on life functions;
(2) Living organisms and their environment are interdependent and are constantly interacting;
(3) Living things change.

Physical Science: The physical world consists of interactions of matter and energy.

Earth Science: The earth and the solar system undergo changes involving different cycles.

B. *Cognitive Skill Objectives*

(1) Use measuring devices and record data properly.
(2) Make graphs and charts from the data given.
(3) Interpret data, charts, and graphs and make generalizations.
(4) Follow directions to utilize simple tests and interpret results.
(5) Employ mathematics necessary to convert units within the metric system.
(6) Develop a hypothesis from basic data and devise a method to test it.
(7) Use, maintain, and care for laboratory equipment.
(8) Distinguish between qualitative and quantitative observations.
(9) Follow laboratory safety rules at all times.
(10) Use "scientific" methods for setting up experiments which have dependent and independent variables.
(11) Communicate information organized in logical sequences orally and graphically using appropriate vocabulary.
(12) Recognize that certain teaching devices, such as a "model," are only teaching aids and are not reality.
(13) Apply scientific theories and laws to a given situation.

C. *Linguistic Features of Academic Language Proficiency*

(1) Vocabulary and technical terminology
(2) Language functions (explaining, informing, describing, clarifying, evaluating)
(3) Language structures (passive voice, noun clauses and phrases, etc.)
(4) Discourse features (expository)
(5) Language skills (listening to explanations, reading for information, participating in academic discussions, writing reports)

D. *Relevant Information/Data*

_____

_____

E. *Mainstreaming Recommendations*

_____

_____

MAINSTREAMING PROCEDURES IN VARIOUS STATES

Mainstreaming procedures, commonly known as exit procedures, vary tremendously across the United States. In some states, as mentioned earlier, methods for student placement and for exit/mainstreaming are mandated by the states. In others, districts develop assessment plans which must be approved by the State Education Agency. In yet others, districts are free to develop their own guidelines for this procedure. An overview of methods for entry/placement and exit for selected states can be found in Table 1. Although space does not permit detailed discussion of the procedures for each state, the methods for several states are discussed in depth below.

In Ohio, the recommended procedure for exit evaluation calls for at least four, and sometimes six, kinds of assessment. These include:

- Testing of second language oral-aural skills;
- Testing of second language literacy skills;
- Testing of content-area knowledge in first or second language;
- Obtaining the teacher's recommendation;
- Obtaining the parent's evaluation; and
- An academic learning time (ALT) study which attempts to measure the student's ability to stay on task and indicates what level of accuracy he or she is attaining in daily classwork while on task (Ohio Department of Education, 1986).

Some school districts in Ohio have found it helpful to establish a trial period of mainstreaming for students who have demonstrated the ability to participate in classroom activities that involve English as the medium of instruction. The purpose of this trial period is to give the student an opportunity to ease into an all-English classroom without taking away his or her native language support.

The decision to trial mainstream a student is based on a consensus reached by the regular classroom teacher, the instructional aide, and the ESL instructor. This trial period can take place while the student remains in the same bilingual classroom and should generally last at least one academic year. During that time, ESL instruction is discontinued, but native language activities continue. The student can be involved in as many all-English activities as possible in order to facilitate his or her transition into the mainstream.

Trial mainstreaming can also be used in ESL instructional settings. During the first year of mainstreaming, the child's progress is monitored. Additional academic and English language support is provided as necessary.[2]

In California[3] the State Education Agency (SEA) recommends that all students be assessed using five different measures. Oral/aural proficiency testing is supplemented by a demonstration of mastery of the English language curriculum. On standardized tests, students are usually required to score above the 36th percentile. In addition to teacher evaluation, parental evaluation is also included as part of the mainstreaming process. The final determination of measures to be used is made at the district level.

Texas[4] joins California and Ohio in making use of multiple measures to determine a LEP student's readiness to enter the mainstream. In addition to requiring a score of IV or V on the oral language proficiency test, Texas has set a percentile score of 40 percent or more on standardized achievement tests of reading and vocabulary before a student can exit from a bilingual/ESL program. Mastery, in English and at grade level, of the essential elements of the statewide curriculum is also required. Additionally, parental recommendations are obtained to supplement the testing data.

Arizona[5] conducts an assessment of oral language proficiency as well as of reading and writing skills in English as part of its mainstreaming procedure. Both teacher evaluation and parental recommendation are obtained, which facilitate the placement decision.

As can be seen on Table 1, many of the states listed use multiple instruments as well as teacher judgment in making mainstreaming placement decisions. Although tests and cut-off scores vary, a large number of the states listed do supplement data obtained on oral language proficiency tests with data from reading and standardized achievement tests to exit students from bilingual/ESL programs. This may indicate that the trend is now toward a more realistic prediction of students' ability to function in the mainstream classroom.

[2]Dan Fleck, Ohio Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio, personal communication, February 24, 1988.

[3]David Dolson, California Department of Education, personal communication, February 25, 1988.

[4]Delia Pompa, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas, personal communication, February 29, 1988.

[5]Information about Arizona was obtained from the Special Issues Analysis Center, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, Washington, DC.

TABLE 1

SELECTED STATE ENTRY/EXIT METHODS[a]

STATE	IDENTIFICATION METHODS	EXIT METHODS	INSTRUMENTS USED
ALASKA*	Parent questionnaire Language observation questionnaire Language assessment instrument	Holistic assessments Standardized achievement test score	ITBS Comprehension Subtest Teacher Fluency Survey Battle Culture-Free Self-Concept Inventory
ARIZONA*	Home language survey Language survey Language assessment Teacher observation/opinion Parental statement	Reassessment at least every two years Teacher evaluation Student performing at grade level Parental opinion and consultation Objective assessments of English oral language Objective assessments of reading and writing skills	BSM I & II LAS I & II IPT I & II
CALIFORNIA*[b]	Home language survey English oral/aural proficiency test Literacy testing	Mastery of English language curriculum Oral/aural proficiency testing Parental evaluation Teacher evaluation Above 36th percentile on standardized criterion referenced test; some discretion allowed	BINL BSM I & II LAS I & II IPT QSE Other tests with district approval
COLORADO	Parent/teacher checklist Oral language test	Oral language achievement test score Standardized reading and math pre/post test scores Selected self-concept scale Teacher observation and anecdotal records	LAS BSM IPT ITBS
CONNECTICUT*	Spanish/English pre-test Language proficiency tests Standardized achievement tests in reading, math, language	Score at or above 50% on achievement tests Attainment of average academic grades Teacher evaluation and assessment	Standardized achievement tests Oral interview
HAWAII	Home information survey Language proficiency assessment	English language proficiency test score Standardized achievement test	LAS BINL
IDAHO	Home language survey Language assessment test	Teacher observation Cloze reading test Standardized test scores	BINL Brigance-C LAB LAS IPT

[a] Unless otherwise noted, information on this table was obtained from the Special Issues Analysis Center (SIAC), Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, Washington, DC.

[b] David Dolson, California Department of Education, Sacramento, CA, personal communication, February 24, 1988.

* These states mandate special education services for limited-English-proficient students.

TABLE 1

SELECTED STATE ENTRY/EXIT METHODS

STATE	IDENTIFICATION METHODS	EXIT METHODS	INSTRUMENTS USED
ILLINOIS*[c]	Home language survey Student language Assessment of listening, understanding, speaking, reading and writing Below average English proficiency for native English speakers at grade level in district Academic history Additional factors as determined by SEA and district	Above average English proficiency for native English speakers at grade level in the district Assessment of listening, understanding, speaking, reading and writing Evaluation of same variables used in identification procedure	LAS BSM IDEA FLA (Chicago) BINL BOLT Others with approval of SEA
INDIANA	Teacher observation and referral Cumulative grades and records Speech test Parent information Informal assessment School consultation team Achievement tests Criterion referenced test Language proficiency test	Student grades Teacher evaluation Achievement test scores	ITBS LAS SAT MAT PPVT CAT Gates-McGintie Language Test Articulation test Ginn Reading Test
KENTUCKY	Teacher observation Parental information Kentucky Essential Skills Test Tutor observation Course grades Oral language proficiency Criterion-referenced test	Standardized test scores Classroom performance Teacher recommendations Oral proficiency tests Writing test	Kentucky Essential Skills Test Teacher observation Woodcock Language Proficiency Battery Davis Diagnostic Test for ESL students ITBS SAT
LOUISIANA	Parental information Language proficiency assessment Standardized achievement tests	Standardized achievement test scores Teacher observation	CAT SRA CTBS SAT MAT Criterion-referenced test
MAINE	Home language survey Oral language proficiency tests Informal oral observation	Standardized achievement test scores Oral language proficiency test scores State achievement test score Teacher observation Course grades	LAB BSM CELT BINL IPT MAP
MASSACHUSETTS*	Home language survey Teacher referral Oral interview Language proficiency test	Language proficiency test score Standardized achievement test scores Language continuum instrument Course grades Teacher recommendation Parental input	BSM CTBS Cloze reading test ESL test Metropolitan Reading Survey

[c] Maria Seidner, Illinois Department of Education, Chicago, Illinois, personal communication, February 24, 1988.

* These states mandate special education services for limited-English-proficient students.

TABLE 1

SELECTED STATE ENTRY/EXIT METHODS

STATE	IDENTIFICATION METHODS	EXIT METHODS	INSTRUMENTS USED
MINNESOTA	Teacher referral Parent information Informal assessment Language proficiency test Comprehensive student record Standardized achievement test scores Tutor observation Speech test Course grades Criterion-referenced tests	Teacher judgment Standardized achievement test scores Language proficiency test scores	Teacher-made language proficiency instrument Standardized achievement tests Criterion-referenced tests
MISSISSIPPI	Teacher referral Informal assessment Parent information Course grades Standardized achievement test Speech test Tutor observation Criterion-referenced tests Language proficiency test	Standardized achievement test scores Teacher judgment Progress reports Social participation evaluation	SAT Oral language proficiency test
NEW YORK[d]	Home language identification Score below 23rd percentile on an English language assessment instrument approved by the Commissioner of Education	Score above 23rd percentile on a standardized test of English reading	LAB (New York City) Elsewhere districts select instruments with approval of Commissioner of Education Criterion-referenced tests
NEVADA	Teacher referral Informal assessment Parental information Comprehensive student record Standardized achievement test Language proficiency test Tutor observation Course grades	Standardized achievement test scores	Brigance-D CTBS Criterion-referenced tests LAS BSM CELT ITBS MRT PIAT SAT WRAT
OHIO[e]	Home language survey Oral/aural proficiency testing Literacy testing Subject content knowledge assessment in English and native language	Oral/aural proficiency testing Literacy testing Achievement testing Academic Learning Time Study Parental evaluation Teacher evaluation	State Education Agency recommends a variety of standardized and informal measures

[d] Peter Byron, New York State Department of Education, personal communication, February 24, 1988.

[e] Dan Fleck, Ohio Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio, personal communication, February 24, 1988.

TABLE 1

SELECTED STATE ENTRY/EXIT METHODS

STATE	IDENTIFICATION METHODS	EXIT METHODS	INSTRUMENTS USED
OKLAHOMA[f]	Teacher observation and referral Speech test Parent information Tutor observation Informal assessment Student records School consultation team Achievement tests Criterion-referenced tests Language proficiency tests	Teacher observation and referral Speech test Parent information Tutor observation Informal assessment Student records School consultation team Achievement Tests Criterion-referenced tests Language proficiency tests	Standardized achievement tests
TEXAS*[g]	Home language survey Oral language proficiency tests (English and/or Spanish) Informal assessment (teacher/parent interview, student interview, teacher survey) Standardized achievement test scores Classroom grades	Grade score over IV or V on oral language proficiency test and in program for more than one year Reading comprehension and vocabulary above the 40th percentile on standardized measures Mastery in English at grade level of the essential elements of the statewide curriculum Parent recommendation Criterion-referenced test	State Education Agency approved list of oral language proficiency tests and written achievement tests Criterion-referenced tests
WISCONSIN*	Teacher/counselor referral Parent information Informal testing Comprehensive student records Speech test Standardized achievement test Language proficiency test Tutor observation Criterion-referenced test	Standardized achievement test scores Teacher judgment	CTBS Teacher-made tests
WYOMING	Home language survey Oral English language assessment score Standardized achievement test scores Teacher referral One year or more deficiency in grade level in language	Oral English language assessment score	IPT LAS

[f] Raul Font, Oklahoma State Education Agency, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, personal communication, February 23, 1988.

[g] Delia Pompa, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas, personal communication, February 29. 1988.

* These states mandate special education services for limited-English-proficient students.

KEY TO TESTS LISTED ON TABLE 1

BINL: Basic Inventory of Natural Language
BOLT: Bilingual Oral Language Tests
Brigance-C: Brigance Comprehensive Inventory of Basic Skills - English and Spanish
Brigance-D: Brigance Diagnostic Assessment of Basic Skills - Spanish
CAT: California Achievement Test
CELT: Comprehensive English Language Test
CTBS: Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills
FLA: Functional Language Assessment
IPT: Idea Oral Language Proficiency Test
ITBS: Iowa Test of Basic Skills
LAB: Language Assessment Battery
LAS: Language Assessment Survey
MAP: Maculatis Assessment Program
MAT: Metropolitan Achievement Test
MRT: Metropolitan Readiness Test
PIAT: Peabody Individual Achievement Test
PPVT: Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test
QSE: Quick Start in English
SAT: Stanford Achievement Test
SRA: Science Research Associates, Inc.
TAP: Total Academic Proficiency
WRAT: Wide Range Achievement Test

For further information on these tests, readers may contact the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education at 1-800-647-0123 or (301) 933-9448.

CONCLUSION

Mainstreaming language minority students from bilingual and ESL programs is, and will continue to be, an educational and sociopolitical reality. One of our greatest responsibilities is to prepare language minority students, now attending American schools in increasing numbers, as best we can for their continued education in the mainstream. We can begin to do this by implementing mainstreaming procedures which accurately and fairly determine their readiness for learning in the mainstream and by making recommendations for further education toward that end. We would be well-advised to employ small teams of individuals from both bilingual/ESL and mainstream programs to assume the task and the responsibility of making such decisions. Other dimensions not discussed in this paper should also be assessed, namely study skills and learning strategies. Perhaps students' attitudes toward themselves, their culture, and the majority culture and appropriate cultural behavior patterns for the English-speaking classroom should also be assessed.

The approach to mainstreaming presented in this article is not simple to implement, nor does it purport to answer all questions or solve all problems. This paper does, however, review existing mainstreaming procedures, suggest issues for consideration in this process, and outline steps to follow in establishing and reviewing procedures for mainstreaming of language minority students. These aspects are crucial to success in the mainstreaming process.

REFERENCES

Ambert, A., J. Greenberg, and S. Pereira (1980). *Manual for identification of limited-English-proficient students with special needs.* Boston, MA: Massachusetts Department of Education, Bilingual Special Education Department.

Ausubel, D.P. (1969). *School learning: An introduction to educational psychology.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Bloom, B.S., Hastings, J.T., & Madaus, G.F. (1971). *Handbook on formative and summative evaluation of student learning.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Byron, P. New York State Department of Education, personal communication, February 24, 1988.

California Department of Education (1987). *Coordinated compliance review instrument section on the state program for students of limited-English-proficiency.* Sacramento, CA.

Canale, M. (1983). On some dimensions of language proficiency. In *Issues in language testing research*, J.W. Oller (Ed.). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Cardoza, D. (1984). The reclassification survey: a study of entry and exit procedures. In *Bilingual Education Studies Progress Report 3*, 1-23. Los Alamitos, CA: National Center for Bilingual Research.

Cavalheiro, R.D. (1981). *The relationship between language proficiency and academic achievement of Spanish-speaking pupils.* Ph.D. Dissertation. Claremont Graduate School.

Chamot, A.U. (1981). *Applications of second language acquisition research to the bilingual classroom.* Focus No. 8. Wheaton, Maryland: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Chamot, A.U. & O'Malley, J.M. (1986). *A cognitive academic language learning approach: An ESL content-based curriculum.* Wheaton, Maryland: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Cervantes, R.A. (1979). Bilingual program exit criteria. *Bilingual Resources* 2(3), 14-16.

Coulopoulous, D. and G.P. DeGeorge. (1982). *Current methods and practices of school psychologists in the assessment of linguistic minority children.* Boston, MA: Massachusetts Department of Education.

Connecticut, State of (1981). *A guide to curriculum development in science.* Hartford, CT: Connecticut State Board of Education.

Connecticut State Department of Education (November 8, 1984). *Connecticut Regulations and Guidelines Concerning Bilingual Education Programs.* Sect. 10-17.H-3, 4, 5, 10. Hartford, CT.

Crespo, O. D. (1985). *Selection procedure: for identifying students in need of special language services. Final phase 1 report.* Submitted to U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget and Management, September, 1985. Washington, DC: Pelavin Associates, Inc.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research*, 49(2), 222-51.

Cummins, J. (1980). The entry and exit fallacy. *NABE Journal*, 4 (3), 25-29.

Cummins, J. (1983a.) Functional language proficiency in context: Classroom participation as an interactive process. In *Compatibility of the SBIF features with other research on instruction for LEP students*, W.J. Tikunoff (Ed.). San Francisco: Far West Laboratory.

Cummins, J. (1983b). *Policy Report. Language and literacy learning in bilingual instruction.* Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Cummins, J. (1983c). Language proficiency and academic achievement. In *Issues in language testing research*, J.W. Oller (Ed.), Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy.* San Diego, CA: College Hill Press, 1984.

De Avila, E.A., S. Duncan, D. Ulibarri, and J.S. Fleming. (1979). *Predicting the academic success of language minority students from developmental cognitive style, linguistic, and teacher perception measures.* Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

De George, G.P. (1983). Selecting tests for bilingual program evaluation. *Bilingual Journal* 7(2), 22-28.

De George, G.P. (1985). *Process for designing entry/exit procedures and choosing related tests.* Cambridge, MA: Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center, Lesley College.

Dolson, D. California Department of Education, Sacramento, CA. personal communication, February 24, 1988.

Fleck, D. Ohio Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio. personal communication, February 24, 1988.

Font, R. Oklahoma State Education Agency, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, personal communication, February 23, 1988.

Guerin, G.R. and Maier, A.S. (1983). *Informal Assessment in Education*. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing Co.

Hamayan, E.V., J.A. Kwiat, R. Perlman. (1985). *Assessment of language minority students: a handbook for educators.* Arlington Heights, IL: Illinois Resource Center.

Hayes, Z.A. (1982). *'Limited' language proficiency: a problem in the definition and measurement of bilingualism.* Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.

Jones, P.A. (1981). *Prediction of success in English reading achievement for primary students enrolled in bilingual classrooms: The utility of a language assessment measure.* Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Colorado at Boulder.

Klee, C.A. (1984). *A discourse analysis of the oral language interactions of Spanish-English bilingual children in three environments.* Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Texas, Austin.

Lazos, H. (1981). *A study of the relationship of language proficiency in the mother tongue and acquisition of second language reading skills in bilingual children at age twelve.* Ph.D. Dissertation. The University of Texas, Austin.

Lindvall, C.N. and Nitko, A.J. (1975). *Measuring pupil achievement and aptitude.* Second Ed. New York: Hartcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich.

Ohio Department of Education. (1983). *Strategies for developing language programs for national origin minority students.* Columbus, Ohio.

Ohio Department of Education. (1986). *Guidelines for the establishment and implementation of entry and exit criteria for bilingual education programs.* Columbus, Ohio.

Oller, J.W. (1979). *Language testing and schools.* London: Longman

Placer-Barber, V. (1981). Starting an English-as-a-second-language program. *Bilingual Education Resource Series*, Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Education.

Pompa, D. Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas, personal communication, February 29, 1988.

Rivera, C. and N. Lombardo. (1982). Considerations for developing language assessment procedures. In *Bilingual Education Researcher Handbook: Language Issues in Multicultural Settings*. M. Montero, (Ed.). Cambridge, MA: Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center.

Seidner, M. Illinois Department of Education, Chicago, Illinois, personal communication, February 24, 1988.

Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (1980). *Resources for Developing a Student Placement System for Bilingual Programs.* Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory.

Special Issues Analysis Center, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, Washington, DC.

Stanley, J.C. and K.D. Hopkins, (1972). *Educational and psychological measurement and evaluation.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Task Force on Cross-cultural Assessment. (1980). *The time for action: positions and recommendations of the task force on cross-cultural assessment.* Highstown, NJ: Northeast Regional Resource Center.

Tikunoff, W.J. (1985). *Applying significant bilingual instructional features in the classroom.* Wheaton, Maryland: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Turnbull, H. R. (1986). *Free appropriate public education: The law and children with disabilities.* Denver, CO: Love Publishing Co.

About the Author

George P. De George is Associate Education Consultant for Bilingual Education with the Connecticut State Department of Education. Previously, he was Deputy Director of the Evaluation Assistance Center at RMC Research Corporation in Hampton, New Hampshire. He served as Training and Evaluation Manager at the Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center in Cambridge, Massachusetts, from 1975 to 1985. Before that, he was evaluator of the New Bedford, Massachusetts, Title VII program.

Mr. De George has conducted extensive training and technical assistance programs throughout the country in testing, program evaluation, and placement/exit procedures. From 1981 to 1984 he directed three regional management institutes for directors of bilingual programs. He is editor of *Improving Bilingual Program Management: A Handbook for Title VII Directors* and *Bilingual Program Management: A Problem-Solving Approach* (National Dissemination Center, Fall River, Massachusetts). He is currently an Ed.D. candidate at Boston University.

This publication was prepared under Contract No. 300860069 for the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA), U.S. Department of Education. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Enrique M. Cubillos, Director

Shelley P. Gutstein, Publications Coordinator

Lorraine Valdez Pierce, Series Editor

Are You Familiar with NCBE Services?

The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE) responds to your questions related to the education of limited-English-proficient (LEP) populations through:

Information Services

NCBE provides information to practitioners in the field about curriculum materials, program models, methodologies and research findings on the education of limited-English-proficient persons. We continually collect and review materials on bilingual education, English as a second language, refugee education, vocational education, educational technology and related areas.

Electronic Information System

NCBE offers electronic access to its information system at no cost. Users are able to search a database of information containing curriculum materials and literature related to the education of limited-English-proficient students. An electronic bulletin board, which contains news from federal, state and local education agencies, conference announcements and other current information, is also available.

Publications

NCBE develops and publishes three types of publications: a bimonthly newsletter, occasional papers, and program information guides. All publications focus on significant issues related to the education of LEP students.

Contact Us

Contact NCBE by telephone, weekdays between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. (EST).

Outside Maryland call: (800) 647-0123.

In Maryland call: (301) 933-9448.

If you prefer to contact us by mail, our address is:

ncbe
the national clearinghouse for bilingual education
1501 Georgia Avenue, Wheaton, Maryland 20902
800-647-0123 • (301) 933-9448